

Perturbation Theory for Arbitrary Coupling Strength ?

Bimal P. Mahapatra^{1*} and Noubihary Pradhan^{2†}

¹*School of Physical Sciences, National Institute of Science Education and Research (NISER), Bhubaneswar 751005, India*

²*Department of Physics, G.M.University, Sambalpur 768004, India*

(Dated: August 4, 2016)

We demonstrate Borel summability for *arbitrary coupling strength* in a *new* formulation of perturbation theory (designated here as “Mean Field Perturbation Theory (MFPT)”) by applying it to one dimensional anharmonic-interactions, which includes the case of the quartic and sextic anharmonic oscillators(AHO) and the quartic double-well oscillator(QDWO).It is well known that the perturbation-series is *not* Borel-summable for the QDWO in the standard formulation of perturbation theory(SFPT). In contrast,MFPT leads to a Borel-summable perturbation series and accurate values for the energy-spectra for arbitrary(physical)value of the coupling strength in each case as stated above.The general nature and the simplicity of the formulation underlying MFPT leads us to *conjecture* that this scheme may be applicable to arbitrary interactions in quantum theory.

PACS numbers: 11.15.Bt,11.10.Jj,11.25.Db,12.38.Cy,03.65.Ge

1.*Introduction.*– Approximation methods are inevitably employed [1] in the investigation of interacting quantum systems since exact analytical results are sparse. Perturbation theory continues to be the preferred method of approximation for various practical and theoretical reasons [2].Particularly, in the case of quantum field theory it appears difficult [3] at present to implement the renormalization program in any scheme other than perturbation theory.

However, it is well known that the standard formulation of perturbation theory (SFPT) suffers from a number of limitations arising from its *defining* property of small-coupling-power-series-expansion. Perhaps the most severe limitation of SFPT is its inability to describe the important class of the so-called ‘non-perturbative’ phenomena governed by large values of the coupling-strength and/or non-analytic-dependence on it. Other problems in SFPT include: the instability of the ‘perturbative-vacuum’[4] and inconsistency with the known analytic properties [5] of physical observables as a function of the coupling-strength.

Even for small values of the coupling, the perturbation-series(PS) generically exhibits [6] divergent but asymptotic growth at large-orders: $|\mathcal{E}_k| \sim c^k \Gamma(ak+b)$, for $k \gg 1$, where a, b, c are constants depending upon the particular theory under consideration; $\mathcal{E}_k$ is the ‘k-th’-order contribution in SFPT defined by $E(g) = \mathcal{E}_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} g^k \mathcal{E}_k \equiv \mathcal{E}_0 + \Delta \mathcal{E}(g)$, where $E(g)$ is an observable of the system . The asymptotic-nature of the PS manifests through the following property: [7]: $\lim_{g \rightarrow 0_+} (E(g) - \sum_{k=0}^N g^k \mathcal{E}_k) / g^{N+1} = \mathcal{E}_{N+1}$. The standard procedure for constructing the analytic function $E(g)$ from its divergent, asymptotic series about $g \rightarrow 0_+$ is via the method of Borel-summation [6, 7]. Indeed, the ‘sum’ of the divergent, asymptotic PS is now customarily *defined*[6, 7] by its Borel-sum when the latter exists. However, it is well known that

Borel-summability *fails* [8] for *any* value of the coupling in the case of several important physical systems such as: the quartic-double-well-oscillator(QDWO), QCD, the Fokker-Planck-system etc, thus exposing further limitations of SFPT.

In view of the above mentioned inadequacies of SFPT, it is perhaps imperative to explore whether perturbation theory could at all be liberated from the limitations of small-coupling-power-series-expansion. This letter is devoted to such an exploration in some detail.

For this investigation, we choose the stationary-energy, $E_n(g)$ of the quantum-system as the observable, being defined by the eigen-value equation for the Hamiltonian: $H(g)|\psi_n(g)\rangle = E_n(g)|\psi_n(g)\rangle$. The Hamiltonian, $H(g)$ can be split into an *exactly solvable* dominant part H_0 and a *sub-dominant* perturbation H' i.e. $H(g) = H_0 + H'$. For the realization of a perturbative-framework for arbitrary values of the coupling g , it may be *sufficient* to fulfill the following two conditions:(a) both H_0 and H' must depend *non-trivially* upon the coupling strength g , i.e. $H_0 = H_0(g)$ and $H' = H'(g)$ such that the dominant g -dependence resides in $H_0(g)$ and further that (b) the contribution of the perturbing Hamiltonian $H'(g)$ remains sub-dominant for arbitrary value of g . A practical implementation of the above conditions can be achieved [9, 10] through the following steps: (i) choose H_0 to depend upon a suitable set of free parameters $\{\alpha_i\}$ i.e. $H_0 = H_0(\{\alpha_i\})$, then (ii) impose the constraint that

$$\langle \phi_n | H(g) | \phi_n \rangle = \langle \phi_n | H_0(\{\alpha_i\}) | \phi_n \rangle, \quad (1)$$

for all physical ‘ n ’ and ‘ g ’ where, $|\phi_n\rangle$ are defined by the eigen-value equation for H_0 : $H_0|\phi_n\rangle = E_0^n|\phi_n\rangle$, with ‘ n ’ denoting the spectral-label. Finally, (iii) determine the parameters $\{\alpha_i\}$ by the constraint given by (1) and by further variational-minimization of $\langle \phi_n | H(g) | \phi_n \rangle$, if needed. By this simple procedure, the non-linear g -dependence of the system-Hamiltonian, $H(g)$ is effectively fed- back into the “mean-field Hamil-

tonian(MFH)", H_0 :

$$H_0(\{\alpha_i\}) \rightarrow H_0(g, n) \quad (2)$$

The solution of the eigen-value equation for $H_0(g, n)$, then generates the results for $E_0^n(g)$, which forms the leading-order (LO) result, which are expected to provide the major contribution for the true eigen-value, $E_n(g)$. (This expectation has been explicitly verified [9, 10] for anharmonic-interactions (AHI) by obtaining uniformly accurate results for $E_n(g)$ in the LO, for arbitrary physical values of 'g' and 'n'.)

In view of (1), we designate this method as the "mean-field approximation scheme". Furthermore, a perturbative frame-work is naturally suggested in view of (1-2) which also ensures condition-(b), as discussed in the next section.

2. Mean field perturbation theory.— A new formulation of perturbation theory, which we designate as "Mean-Field-Perturbation Theory (MFPT)", can be achieved by defining the perturbation about the MFH: $H'(g, n) \equiv H(g) - H_0(g, n)$. An immediate consequence of this prescription is the following result: $\langle \phi_n | H'(g, n) | \phi_n \rangle = 0$ for all n and g , which follows from (1-2). This result ensures condition-(b) mentioned above (in the sense of quantum-average) for arbitrary value of 'g' and 'n' since $\langle H'(g) \rangle \ll \langle H_0(g) \rangle \equiv E_0^n(g)$. (Here, the quantum-average of an operator A is defined as: $\langle A \rangle \equiv \langle \phi_n | A | \phi_n \rangle$). Moreover, the above choice for H' also leads to the result that the first-order correction in the Rayleigh-Schrödinger-perturbation series(RSPS) given by the formula: $E_1^n \equiv \langle \phi_n | H' | \phi_n \rangle$, vanishes identically all 'n' and 'g'. These defining-features in MFPT have important bearing on the properties of perturbation-series, which is defined as (henceforth, we do not display the n -dependence of the various quantities, for notational-convenience):

$$E(g) = E_0(g) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} E_k(g) \equiv E_0(g) + \Delta E(g).$$

Since the above series is *not* a power-series-expansion in g , we resort to the standard recipe of introducing an auxiliary, *dummy* parameter denoted as η , for generating a power-series in this parameter (chosen real). This procedure requires the introduction of an associated-Hamiltonian(AH), $\bar{H}$ given by $\bar{H} \equiv H_0 + \eta H'$, and the corresponding eigen-value equation:

$$\bar{H}(\eta, g) |\psi(\eta, g)\rangle = \bar{E}(\eta, g) |\psi(\eta, g)\rangle,$$

such that $\bar{E}(\eta, g)$ can be expanded as a power-series in η : $\bar{E}(\eta, g) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \eta^k E_k(g)$. The 'k-th' perturbation-correction E_k can then be identified from the above equation as the coefficient of η^k before setting the limit, $\eta \rightarrow 1$.

We determine the corrections E_k to arbitrary order k in MFPT, using the recursion relations derived from the application of the 'hyper-virial(HV) theorem' and

the 'Feynman-Hellman(FH) theorem' to the Hamiltonian, $\bar{H}$. This method has the decided advantage over other approaches since it produces *exact* analytic results for perturbation-corrections to an arbitrary order, whereas other methods are afflicted by inevitable errors such as neglect of sub-asymptotic corrections, truncation-errors etc. (Moreover, the recursive evaluation yields to easy computation, which is an additional practical-advantage.) The computed perturbation-corrections for anharmonic-interactions are presented in the next section.

3(a). HV-FH-Method for the Quartic- and Sextic Anharmonic Oscillators.— The Hamiltonian for both the cases are given by: $H = \frac{1}{2}p^2 + \frac{1}{2}\omega^2 x^2 + gx^{2K}$, ($K = 2, 3$), corresponding to the quartic-AHO (QAHO) and the sextic-AHO (SAHO) respectively. These quantum-systems are quite basic in view of their wide applications[1, 2] in diverse areas of physics and chemistry, as well as, for their use as 'theoretical-laboratories' in testing various aspects of approximation methods in quantum theory [1, 2],[5-7],[9, 10]. In order to apply MFPT, we choose[9] the 'harmonic-approximation' for the input-MFH:

$$H_0 = \frac{1}{2}p^2 + \frac{1}{2}\omega^2 x^2 + h_0, \quad (3)$$

The parameters, ω and h_0 are determined [9] in accordance to the steps(i)-(iii) outlined in Section-1. For the case of the QAHO, this leads [9] to their determination as follows: ω is obtained as the real, +ve root of the equation: $\omega^3 - \omega - 6g(\xi + \frac{1}{4\xi}) = 0$, h_0 is given by $h_0 = (\frac{\xi}{4})(\frac{1}{\omega} - \omega)$ where, $\xi \equiv (n + \frac{1}{2})$; with the spectral-index n taking values: $n = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots$. As expected, these parameters thus acquire the required functional dependence on g and ξ : $\omega \rightarrow \omega(g, \xi)$; $h_0 \rightarrow h_0(g, \xi)$. Similarly, the eigen-values of the MFH are obtained [9] as a function of g and ξ and given by $E_0(g, \xi) = (\xi/4)(3\omega + \frac{1}{\omega})$. It may be emphasized that the above results for $E_0(g, \xi)$ are inherently 'non-perturbative' due to the non-analytic dependence of ω on g as $g \rightarrow 0_+$. Consequently, the rigorously established [5] analytic-structure of $E(g)$ in the g -plane, is trivially contained [9, 10] already at the LO-level. Further, as stated earlier, the accuracy of the energy-spectrum obtained in the LO is quite significant, the deviations from the 'exact'-results being no more than a few-percent [9] over the full-range of 'g' and 'n'.

The perturbation about the MFH is given by: $H' \equiv H - H_0 = gx^{2K} - \frac{1}{2}(\omega^2 - 1)x^2 - h_0$ and consequently, the AH is given by $\bar{H} = \frac{1}{2}p^2 + \frac{1}{2}\omega^2 x^2 + h_0 + \eta(gx^{2K} - \frac{1}{2}(\omega^2 - 1)x^2 - h_0)$. We follow analogous procedure as applied in [2] for the case of the QAHO in SFPT, but now with generalization to MFPT, in the application of HV-theorem to $\bar{H}$. This results in the following

recursion-relation:

$$\begin{aligned}
X(j, i) = & a(j)X(j-1, i) + b(j) \sum_{m=0}^i E_m X(j-1, i-m) \\
& + c(j)X(j-2, i) - a(j)X(j-1, i-1) \\
& + e_\omega X(j, i-1) - f(j)X(j+K-1, i-1),
\end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where, $X(j, i)$ are defined by $X(j) \equiv \langle \bar{\psi} | x^{2j} | \bar{\psi} \rangle = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \eta^i X(j, i)$, where $\bar{\psi}$ and $\bar{E}$ are defined earlier and other quantities are given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
a(j) &= (-h_0/\omega^2)(2j-1)/j, \quad b(j) = (2j-1)/(\omega^2 j), \\
c(j) &= (j-1)[4(j-1)^2 - 1]/(4j\omega^2), \\
e_\omega &= (\omega^2 - 1)/\omega^2, \quad f(j) = (g/\omega^2)(2j-1+K)/j.
\end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Similarly, following analogous procedure as in [2], the application of FHT to $\bar{H}(\eta)$ as: $\langle \bar{\psi} | \frac{\partial \bar{H}}{\partial \eta} | \bar{\psi} \rangle = \frac{\partial \bar{E}}{\partial \eta}$ leads to the following additional relations between $X(j, i)$ and E_m :

$$E_1 = gX(K, 0) - \frac{1}{2}(\omega^2 - 1)X(1, 0) - h_0, \quad (6a)$$

$$pE_p = gX(K, p-1) - \frac{1}{2}(\omega^2 - 1)X(1, p-1); p = 2, 3, 4, \dots \quad (6b)$$

The eqs.(4-6) suffice to determine *exactly*, the energy-corrections E_p to *arbitrary-order* p when supplemented by the ‘boundary-conditions’ [2]: $X(0, i) = \delta_{0i}$, and $X(j, i) = 0$ for $j < 0$, where δ_{mn} denotes the Krönerker-symbol. Note that the evaluation of E_p requires the computation of $X(j, i)$ for the values of i, j lying in the following range (in steps of unity): $0 \leq i \leq (p-1)$, and $1 \leq j \leq (K-1)(p-i) + 1$. For the case of the QAHO (i.e. by substituting $K=2$, in (4-6)), we record here the following results for $E_p(g, \xi)$ at $g=1$ and $\xi = \frac{1}{2}$ (i.e. for the ground-state), for some low-lying values of p : $E_1 = 0, E_2 = -\frac{3}{256}, E_3 = \frac{27}{4096}, E_4 = -\frac{2373}{262144}, E_5 = \frac{65457}{4194304} \dots$ etc.

Analogous results for the SAHO can be obtained by substituting $K=3$ in (4-6) along with the following input [9] for ω, h_0 and E_0 : ω is given by the real, positive root of the equation, $\omega^4 - \omega^2 - (15/4)(5 + 4\xi^2) = 0$; $E_0 = (\xi/3)(2\omega + \frac{1}{\omega})$ and $h_0 = (\xi/3)(\frac{1}{\omega} - \omega)$. Sample-values of E_p computed for the ground state of the SAHO and for $\omega = 2$ are the following: $E_1 = 0, E_2 = -\frac{49}{960}, E_3 = \frac{671}{4608}, E_4 = -\frac{53621891}{55296000}, E_5 = \frac{2610955409}{265420800} \dots$ etc. As expected [11], the resultant asymptotic series exhibits more

severe divergence at large orders as compared to that of the QAHO. We consider next, the case of the QDWO.

3(b). *The Quartic Double well Oscillator (QDWO).* – As already mentioned, the case of the QDWO is not Borel-summable [8] in SFPT for any value of the coupling-strength. Several modern developments [12, 13] such as the theory of resurgence and trans-series[12], distributional-Borel-summation [13] etc are basically motivated to surmount this problem. In view of the above scenario, the case of the QDWO is of special relevance for investigation in MFPT. The Hamiltonian in this case, is given by: $H = (1/2)p^2 - (1/2)x^2 + gx^4$, and the MFH is again chosen in the harmonic-approximation as: $H_0 = (1/2)p^2 + (1/2)\omega^2(x - \sigma)^2 + h_0$, but generalized to take into account, the spontaneous symmetry breaking (SSB), through a non-zero vacuum-expectation-value for x denoted as σ . The parameters ω, σ and h_0 are determined analogously as in the case of the AHO. The LO-results [9] display ‘quantum-phase transition(QPT)’ governed by a critical-coupling: $g_c(\xi)$ given by the ex-

pression: $g_c(\xi) = \frac{(2/3)^{3/2}}{3(5\xi - (1/4\xi))}$, such that the SSB-phase is realized with $\sigma \neq 0$ for $g \leq g_c(\xi)$, whereas the ‘symmetry-restored(SR)-phase’ is obtained with $\sigma = 0$ when $g > g_c(\xi)$. (Numerically, we have: $g_c = 0.09718$, for the ground-state of the QDWO.) The transition across $g = g_c(\xi)$ being discontinuous, the two phases are governed by distinct expressions for ω and E_0 , which are *not* analytically connected. It is, therefore, necessary to consider the two-phases separately. However, owing to the rather small-value of g_c the ‘SSB-phase’ exists only over a very limited range of g , i.e. when $0 \leq g_c \leq 0.09718$ for the ground state and g_c takes even smaller values for the higher excited states, eventually vanishing for large- n . We therefore, confine here to reporting the results for the ‘SR-phase’ only. In this phase we have: $g > g_c(\xi)$; $\sigma = 0$; ω satisfies the equation, $\omega^3 + \omega - 6g(\xi + \frac{1}{4\xi}) = 0$; $E_0 = (\xi/4)(3\omega - (1/\omega))$; $h_0 = E_0 - \omega\xi$. The perturbation-Hamiltonian and the AH are now respectively given by: $H' = gx^4 - (1/2)(\omega^2 + 1)x^2 - h_0$, $\bar{H} = (1/2)p^2 + (1/2)\omega^2 x^2 + h_0 + \eta(gx^4 - (1/2)(\omega^2 + 1)x^2 - h_0)$. The application of the HV-theorem to $\bar{H}$ leads to the recursion relation *identical* to that of QAHO as given by (4) but with the following *changes*: the input-parameters, ω, h_0 and E_0 are as given above; $K=2$ and e_ω (see, (4,5)) is now defined as: $e_\omega = \omega^2/(\omega^2 + 1)$. Similarly, relations analogous to (6), follow from the application of FH-theorem to this case: $E_1 = gX(2, 0) - (1/2)(\omega^2 + 1)X(1, 0) - h_0$, $pE_p = gX(2, p-1) - (1/2)(\omega^2 + 1)X(1, p-1); p = 2, 3, 4, \dots$ Sample-values for E_p evaluated at $\omega = 1$ and $\xi = 1/2$ are the following: $E_1 = 0, E_2 = -\frac{1}{24}, E_3 = \frac{1}{16}, E_4 = -\frac{791}{3456}, E_5 = \frac{7273}{6912} \dots$ etc.

The following common-features that emerge from the above computations may be note-worthy : $E_1 = 0$, and the perturbation-series have terms that *alternate* in sign. These two features are found essential in obtaining the ‘sum’ of the perturbation-series as described next.

TABLE I. Results for the total-perturbation-correction (TPC) to the ground state energy of the QAH0, SAHO and QDWO are presented for different values of the coupling-strength g in col.(1). The legends used and entries in other columns are as follows: E_{MOT} in col.(3) are the computed energy-values by the ‘method of optimal-truncation’(MOT) , see eq.(7); N_0 in col.(2) displays the value of the cut-off at the ‘term of least magnitude(TLM)’ ; in col.(4) the relative-(%)error of approximation by E_{MOT} with respect to entries shown in col.(10) marked as ‘Exact’, are given ; in col.(5) r_c are the input- values of the ‘radius of convergence’ of the Borel-series defined in eq.(9); N_c in col.(6) denotes the number of terms retained in the Borel-series, eq.(11) for convergence up to the required accuracy; ΔE in col.(7) represents the TPC due to the Borel-sum in eq.(12), after convergence; E_0 in col.(8) denotes the LO-contribution ; E_{tot} in col.(9) represents the ‘total corrected energy’ after Borel-summation; entries in col.(10) labeled *Exact* display the ‘standard’-numerical results from the indicated reference and the last column specifies the *error%* of approximation by E_{tot} with respect to the ‘Exact’ result. For each case of anharmonic-interaction, the input-value of γ , (see eq.(8)) is indicated. We have fixed the value: $\epsilon = 0.001$,(see eq.(12)) in the computation of TPC in all-cases.

g	N_0	E_{MOT}	$Er(\%)$	r_c	N_c	ΔE	E_0	E_{tot}	$Exact$	$Er(\%)$
QAH0 ($\gamma = 1$) <i>ref.</i>(14)										
0.1	6	0.5593	0.03	6.071	6	-0.00116	0.5603	0.5591	0.5591	0.008
1.0	3	0.8074	0.44	2.667	7	-0.00869	0.8125	0.8038	0.8038	0.004
10.0	3	1.5204	1.02	2.133	8	-0.02619	1.5312	1.5050	1.5050	0.002
100.0	3	3.1701	1.23	2.028	10	-0.06101	3.1924	1.1314	3.1314	0.0005
SAHO ($\gamma = 1/2$) <i>ref.</i>(15)										
0.1	2	0.5787	1.40	13.3	20	-0.0095	0.5964	0.5869	0.5869	0.001
1.0	2	0.7694	4.42	8.56	20	-0.0328	0.8378	0.8050	0.8050	0.002
50.0	2	1.7241	7.23	7.14	20	-0.1149	1.9735	1.8586	1.8585	0.007
200.0	2	2.3986	7.54	7.02	20	-0.1662	2.7606	2.5944	2.5942	0.007
QDWO ($\gamma = 1$) <i>ref.</i>(16)										
0.198	2	0.3742	5.97	1.0	20	-0.0360	0.4338	0.3978	0.3980	0.0595
0.5	2	0.4414	2.74	1.191	20	-0.0232	0.4770	0.4538	0.4538	0.0027
1.0	3	0.5667	1.83	1.455	11	-0.0216	0.5989	0.5773	0.5773	0.0042
10.0	3	1.4007	1.66	1.872	20	-0.0320	1.4098	1.3778	1.3778	0.0040
100.0	3	3.1122	1.37	1.972	18	-0.0637	3.1338	3.0701	3.0701	0.0005

4. *Computation of the Total Perturbation Correction(TPC).*– We compute the TPC by two main methods:(a) the method of optimal truncation of the original asymptotic perturbation-series and (b) by Borel-summation. These are described below.(For convenience, we confine her to the computation of E_p for the *ground-state*.)

4.(a) *Method of Optimal Truncation(MOT).*– Utilizing the property [7], that the initial terms of an asymptotic-series continue to decrease in magnitude till the ‘term of the least magnitude’(TLM)is reached, beyond which, the subsequent terms exhibit monotonic increase, the TPC can be reasonably approximated by truncation at the TLM. In the case of MFPT, we have:

$\left(E(g) - \sum_{k=0}^N E_k(g)\right) \leq E_{N+1}(g)$. Therefore, if $N_0(g)$ denotes the ‘order’ of the TLM, the truncation of the series at term, $N_0(g)$ leads to the following estimate of the TPC:

$$E(g) \simeq \sum_{k=0}^{N_0(g)} E_k(g). \quad (7)$$

In Table-I, we present the results from this method for the case of the QAH0, QDWO and SAHO for sample-values of g . It can be seen from this Table that MOT works rather efficiently for arbitrary physical value of g

in MFPT and that the TLM occurs at reasonably low values - $N_0(g) \sim (2-6)$.The primary reason for this latter feature can be traced back to the fact that $E_1(g)$ *vanishes* for arbitrary g . Therefore, since the terms must diverge at large orders, the TLM is constrained to occur at fairly low-values without compromising the accuracy (Table-I). For comparison with ‘standard’ results, we have considered earlier computations in [14],[15] and [16] for the case of QAH0, SAHO and QDWO respectively. The relative-error/deviation from the standard results is seen to be within a few-percent, uniformly over the considered range of g . The MOT in MFPT may, therefore, be regarded as a ‘fail-safe’ method in achieving reasonable accuracy for arbitrary values of g , particularly in view of the fact that it is the only practical method left, for a reasonable estimate of the TPC when other methods such as Borel-summation etc, fail or are inapplicable [17].

4.(b) *Method of Borel Summation*– Consider the generic case when we have $E_j \sim \Gamma(\alpha j + 1)$ for $j \gg 1$. Then, it follows that $\lim_{j \gg 1} b_j \equiv \frac{E_j}{\Gamma(\alpha j + 1)} \rightarrow 0$. Using the integral representation of the Gamma function: $\Gamma(z) = \int_0^\infty dt \exp(-t)t^{z-1}$, one can *formally* express the TPC as :

$$\Delta E(g) \equiv \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} E_k = \gamma \int_0^\infty du \exp(-u^\gamma) u^{\gamma-1} B(u), \quad (8)$$

where, we have defined, $u = t^\alpha$, $\gamma = 1/\alpha$ and $B(u)$ denotes the ‘Borel-Series(BS)’, given by :

$$B(u) \equiv \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} b_j u^j. \quad (9)$$

Note that, although by construction, $B(u)$ has a finite ‘radius of convergence’ r_c , yet the ‘Borel-Laplace-integral’ in (8) does *not* exist since the range of integration extends beyond r_c . Denoting the *analytic continuation* of $B(u)$ to the full-path of integration in (8) by $\tilde{B}(u)$ and substituting this for $B(u)$ there, the integral can be made to *exist* and hence, can be used to ‘*define*’ the TPC as:

$$\Delta E(g) \equiv \gamma \int_0^\infty du \exp(-u^\gamma) u^{\gamma-1} \tilde{B}(u), \quad (10)$$

We carry out the required analytic-continuation of $B(u)$ in (9) by the use of conformal-mapping [18]. This is the *preferred* method[18] when only a finite number of terms in (9) are known/calculable. The input for constructing a conformal map requires the knowledge of the nature and location of the singularity of $B(u)$, occurring closest to the origin in the u -plane. By the ‘Darboux theorem’[19], the late-terms in the series (9) characterize this ‘leading’-singularity. This is readily demonstrated here considering the following *ansatz* for the ‘leading-singularity-approximation’ given by, $\tilde{B}(u) \simeq \tilde{B}_0(u) \sim (u + r_c)^p$. The ‘radius of convergence’ r_c and the ‘singularity-exponent’ p can then be determined from a fast-converging set of equations[2] given below:

$$r_c(g) = \lim_{j \gg 1} \left(\frac{b_j b_{j-1}}{j b_j^2 - (j+1) b_{j+1} b_{j-1}} \right),$$

$$p(g) = \lim_{j \gg 1} \left(\frac{j b_j^2 - (j^2 - 1) b_{j-1} b_{j+1}}{j b_j^2 - (j+1) b_{j+1} b_{j-1}} \right).$$

We determine the value: $p(g) = -0.5$, being independent of g as expected, when the relevant equation converges. Similarly, the values for $r_c(g)$ determined by convergence, are given in Table-I. Equipped with these inputs, we consider the conformal mapping z [18], which maps the cut- u plane, $|\arg(u)| < \pi$ into the interior of the unit-disk in the z -plane while preserving the origin:

$$z(u) = \left(\frac{\sqrt{1+su} - 1}{\sqrt{1+su} + 1} \right), \text{ where } s = (1/r_c); u = t^\alpha.$$

Note that the images of the points: $u = \pm\infty$ are at $z = 1$ and further that $z(u)$ is a real-analytic-function of u . Moreover, the above mapping is proven to be “optimal” by the *Ciulli-Fischer Theorem*[20], in the sense that the error of truncation becomes *minimum* when an arbitrary function, $f(z)$ expanded as an infinite- power-series in z , is approximated by truncation at a finite number of terms. Hence, using this property to advantage, we consider the partial sum of the Borel-Series as defined

in(9): $B_N(u) \equiv \sum_{k=1}^N b_k u^k$. By the use of the inverse-

transformation, $u(z) = \left(\frac{4}{s} \right) \frac{z}{(1-z)^2}$, one obtains: $u^N \sim z^N + O(z^{N+1})$ for $|z| < 1$. Hence, $B_N(u)$ can be consistently re-expanded [21] as follows:

$$B_N(u) \equiv \sum_{k=1}^N b_k u^k \rightarrow \bar{B}_N(z) = \sum_{k=1}^N B_k z^k, \quad (11a)$$

$$\text{where, } B_k = \sum_{n=1}^k b_n \frac{(n+k-1)!}{(k-n)!(2n-1)!}, \quad (11b)$$

where, we have denoted the analytic-continuation of the partial sum of the BS by: $B_N(u) \rightarrow \bar{B}_N(z)$. Using the above properties/results, the TPC can be evaluated by the change of the integration-variable from u to z and substitution of $\bar{B}_N(z)$ for $\tilde{B}(u)$. Then, by taking care of possible numerical-divergence that may occur at the upper limit, $z = 1$ and further, considering the convergence in the limit of the sequence of partial-sums, the TPC can be finally expressed as (we suppress the g -dependence of quantities for notational-clarity):

$$\Delta E = \lim_{N \gg 1, \epsilon \rightarrow 0} (\Delta E)_N \equiv \int_0^{1-\epsilon} dz f_N(z), \quad (12a)$$

$$\text{with } f_N(z) = (\gamma \rho) \frac{(1+z)}{(1-z)^3} \left(\frac{\rho z}{(1-z)^2} \right)^{\gamma-1} \exp \left[- \left(\frac{\rho z}{(1-z)^2} \right)^\gamma \right] \bar{B}_N(z), \quad (12b)$$

where, $\rho = 4r_c$. Note that in contrast to the Borel-series $B(u)$ in(8), term-by-term integration of the partial-sum, $\bar{B}_N(z)$ can now be carried out in (12a) due to the incorporation of analyticity through the conformal-map z . The results are presented in Table-I. It may be seen from this Table that the convergence of the partial-sum is quite fast– an accuracy of $\sim (99.99\%)$ is uniformly achieved over the full explored range of g and for *all* the cases of anharmonic-interaction, when the cut-off N_c on the terms retained for convergence of the partial-sum, is no more than $\sim O(10-20)$. Thus, the ‘*optimality*’ and the ‘*accuracy*’ of the method of conformal mapping, are firmly established in computing the TPC in MFPT.

5. Conclusions.—We have presented a new formulation of perturbation theory based upon a mean-field-like Hamiltonian-approximation and have demonstrated that it is Borel-summable for arbitrary coupling-strength in the case of QAHQ, SAHQ and the QDWO, by obtaining very accurate results for the energy-spectrum. By this demonstration, the distinction between the ‘perturbative’ and the ‘non-perturbative’-regimes appears to be an *artifact* created in SFPT. The obtained results for the QDWO may be of particular significance because this case typically belongs to systems with ‘degenerate ground states’, which are generically found to frustrate Borel-summability in the SFPT and considerable efforts to surmount this problem have been spent in recent times

[12, 13]. It may be also significant that, although the results presented here are based upon the “harmonic-approximation”, a much cruder approximation using the square-well-Hamiltonian as the MFH also succeeds [10] remarkably well in obtaining results of comparable accuracy while preserving the general features of the mean-field-approximation-scheme such as: the non-perturbative character in the LO, existence of a perturbative frame-work for further improvement, consistency with analytic-properties in g , simplicity of implementation etc. In view of these features and the general-nature of the Hamiltonian-formulation, we are inclined to *conjecture* that MFPT may be applicable to arbitrary interacting systems in quantum-theory.

Acknowledgements. – The major part of this investigation was carried out at the National Institute of Science Education and Research (NISER), Bhubaneswar, India while one of the authors (BPM) served there as a visiting Professor. He acknowledges the facilities for research extended to him at the Institute. The authors are grateful to Dr. F. M. Fernández and to Mr. A. B. Mahapatra for help in Maple-programming and for computation, respectively.

* bimal58.mahapatra@gmail.com

† noubiharypradhan1963@gmail.com

- [1] For a recent review, see, e.g. N. Santi, *A Novel, Non-perturbative, Self-consistent Approximation Method in Quantum Theory* (Ph.D. Thesis, Sambalpur University) [arXiv:quant-ph/08062048].
- [2] See, e.g. F.M. Fernández, *Introduction to Perturbation Theory in Quantum Mechanics* (CRC-Press, 2001).
- [3] R.P. Feynman, in *Variational Calculations in Quantum Field Theory* (World Scientific, 1987).
- [4] B. P. Mahapatra, N. Santi and N.B. Pradhan, Ind. J. Pure and Appl. Phys. **39**, 545 (2001); Santi, ref.[1]; G. Preparata, in ref.[3]; Y. Srivastava, O. Panella and A. Widom, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A24**, 1097 (2009) and references cited therein.
- [5] B. Simon, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **58**, 76 (1970).
- [6] J. Zinn-Justin, Phys. Rep. **70**, 109 (1981); J.C. LeGillou and J. Zinn-Justin (Eds.) *Large-Order Behaviour of Perturbation Theory* (North Holland, Amsterdam 1990); J. Fischer, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A12**, 3625 (1997).
- [7] C.M. Bender and S.A. Orszag, *Advanced Mathematical Methods for Scientists and Engineers* (McGraw-Hill Book Company 1978); Fischer, ref.[6]; H. Kleinert and V. Schulte-Frohlinde, in *Critical Properties of ϕ^4 Theories* (World Scientific, 2001), Chap. 16.
- [8] J. Zinn-Justin and U.D. Jentschura, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **313**, 197 (2004) and references cited therein; Zinn-Justin, ref.[6]; Fischer, ref.[6].
- [9] B.P. Mahapatra, N. Santi and N.B. Pradhan, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A 20**, 2687 (2005) [arXiv: quant-ph/ 0406036]; N. Santi, ref.[1].
- [10] B. P. Mahapatra and N. B. Pradhan, [arXiv: **1405.2774v1**[quant-ph]].
- [11] C. M. Bender and C. S. Wu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **27**, 461 (1971), Zinn-Justin, ref.[6].
- [12] For recent reviews, see, e.g. G. V. Dunne, Lectures in Schladming Winter School, *Intersections between QCD and Condensed Matter*, March 1-6, 2015; D. Dorigoni, [arXiv: **1411.3585v2**[hep-th]].
- [13] E. Caliceti et al., Phys. Rep. **446** 1 (2007) [arXiv: **0707.1596 v1**[physics.comp-ph]].
- [14] W.E. Caswell, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **123**, 153 (1979); C.S. Hsue and J.L. Chern, Phys. Rev. **D29**, 643 (1984); I.D. Feranchuk et al., Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **238**, 370 (1995).
- [15] F. T. Hioe, D. MacMillen and E. W. Montroll, J. Math. Phys. **17** 1320 (1976); H. Meißner and E.O. Steinborn, Phys. Rev. A **56**, 1189 (1997).
- [16] Caswell, ref.[14]; Hsue and Chern, ref.[14].
- [17] G.B. West, Foundations in Physics, **30** 695 (2000) [arXiv: **hep-ph/9911416 v1**].
- [18] S. Ciulli and J. Fischer, Nucl. Phys. **24**, 465 (1961); I. Caprini and J. Fischer, Phys. Rev. **D60**, 054014 (1999); R.R. Parwani, Phys. Rev. **D63**, 054014 (2001); Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A18**, 293 (2003); I. M. Suslov, JETP **93**, 1 (2001).
- [19] See, e.g. R. B. Dingle, *Asymptotic Expansions: Their Derivation and Interpretation* (Academic Press, 1973), p. 140.
- [20] Ciulli and Fischer, ref.[18].
- [21] See, e.g. Kleinert and Schulte-Frohlinde, ref.[7]; Suslov, ref.[18].